

### **Remarks**

The Office Action mailed May 24, 2007 has been fully considered. Claims 1-9 remain pending in the application. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and figures, e.g., in FIGS. 3-6. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

### **Priority**

Applicants have amended the cross-reference and related application information to clarify that this application is a divisional application of U.S. Application Serial No. 09/455,299, filed on Dec. 6, 1999, now U.S. Patent No. 6,692,483, issued Feb. 17, 2004.

### **Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,129,738 to Lashinski et al. (hereinafter "Lashinski"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, advancing a stent delivery system over a main guidewire; and subsequently, advancing a branch guidewire through a flexible side sheath attached to a catheter and into a branch vessel.

In contrast, Lashinski does not disclose or suggest advancing a stent delivery system over a main guidewire to a position proximate a bifurcation; and subsequently, advancing a branch guidewire through a flexible side sheath attached to a catheter and into a branch vessel.

Lashinski discloses an embodiment in which a second guidewire 130 is advanced through a catheter after a first and second lumen 105, 110, respectively, are advanced over a first guidewire 125. See Lashinski, col. 6, ll. 47-63, and FIGS. 3A-3C. The second guidewire 130 is not equivalent to the branch guidewire recited in claim 1. The second guidewire 130 is not advanced into a branch vessel. The first guidewire 125 also is not equivalent to the branch guidewire recited in claim 1. The first guidewire 125 is not advanced through a flexible side sheath subsequent to advancement of a stent delivery system.

The embodiments discussed in FIGS. 1(A-E), 2, and 2(A-F) suffer from the shortcomings discussed in the previous response.

Further, the embodiments of Lashinski shown in FIGS. 4-5 disclose advancing a first guidewire 208 into a body; advancing a second guidewire 212 into a distal tip structure 230; and then advancing a delivery system and the distal tip structure 230 to the bifurcation. The first guidewire 208 is not equivalent to the branch guidewire recited in claim 1. The first guidewire 208 is not advanced into a branch vessel. The second guidewire 212 also is not equivalent to the branch guidewire recited in claim 1. The second guidewire 212 is not advanced through a flexible side sheath subsequent to advancement of a stent delivery system to a position proximate the bifurcation.

With respect to FIG. 6 of Lashinski, a first guide wire is placed within the body and a second guide wire is threaded into one of the guide wire lumen 305, 310. The catheter 300 including the second guide wire is then tracked to a treatment site. See Lashinski, col. 7, ll. 31-45.


For at least these reasons, Lashinski does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 7 recites, in part, advancing a stent delivery system over a main guidewire; and subsequently, advancing a branch guidewire through a flexible side sheath and into a branch vessel.

Lashinski does not anticipate claim 7, therefore, for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 7-9 is respectfully requested. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in the form of a Notice of Allowance. If a phone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues related to this matter, please contact Applicant attorney listed below at 612.371.5387.



Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: July 24, 2007

/Joshua N. Randall/  
Joshua N. Randall  
Reg. No. 50,719  
JNR/JKS:rlk